

have fought it. This administration has embraced it.

It is a big revenue transfer from U.S. Treasury to the treasuries of other countries. Unsurprisingly, this feature—this pillar 1—has been a high priority for these other countries. As I say, they have long sought this source of money. That is pillar 1.

Pillar 2 is an agreement by OECD countries to impose a 15-percent minimum tax on the foreign income of their multinational countries.

Now, why was this important? Well, this is very important to the Biden administration because they want to raise the tax imposed on foreign income of U.S. multinationals, and they at least implicitly acknowledge that if foreign countries don't do likewise—if they don't have a very burdensome tax regime like we are going to create under the Biden plan—then we would be at a huge competitive disadvantage, and multinationals would have no choice but to flee the United States and many, many jobs going with them. So that is pillar 2.

Now, here is one of the big problems with this whole arrangement, this whole negotiation. As I said before, the administration has implicitly acknowledged that if the rest of the world doesn't impose this huge minimum tax on their multinationals, we would be at a huge competitive disadvantage. That is why they negotiate with us. But there is a very real possibility that some of these countries—many of them—may not implement a global minimum tax, despite the tentative agreement. And there are at least two reasons.

One is, these countries have only reluctantly agreed to pillar 2 in the first place. They didn't think this was such a great idea, but they agreed to it in return for pillar 1—right?—in return for the commitment that they would be able to grab some of the tax revenue that we normally collect.

There is a problem with that. Implementing pillar 1 requires changing the treaties—the multilateral or the bilateral tax treaties—that the United States has with these other countries. Changing the treaty requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate because under the Constitution, ratification of a treaty is subject to a two-thirds vote.

Well, guess what. I don't think there is two-thirds of the U.S. Senate prepared to vote for this tax giveaway to these other countries. So if I am right, then pillar 1 never gets implemented. If pillar 1 never gets implemented, then the sole motivation for these countries to raise their corporate global minimum tax goes away.

So I am not sure how they square this circle. And at a minimum, I would think they ought to sort this out—the administration, that is—before they just go ahead and put American companies at a huge competitive disadvantage.

By the way, even if they get their way exactly, we are going to be at a

huge competitive disadvantage. The best they could negotiate from OECD countries was a global minimum tax of 15 percent.

Their own proposal has an effective global minimum tax rate of 26 percent that we will be imposing on our own companies. That is a pretty big difference on the margin, and it creates an incentive to have your multinational headquartered somewhere other than the United States of America. That is a very bad idea.

So I think there is a very substantial risk that when the administration gets wrapped around the axle because they are finding they can't get the two-thirds majority in the Senate for us to inflict this wound on ourselves—on our own economy—well, the rest of the world is going to rethink raising their minimum tax. And yet—and yet—our Democratic colleagues seem determined to move ahead with this huge tax increase and all this spending. And who knows, maybe it passes any day now.

But let me be clear, this is a destructive tax increase. It will hurt American workers, make the United States a less competitive place to do business, whether or not the rest of the world follows suit. And so I would just urge my colleagues, don't do this damage. I don't know what people think they are fixing.

In 2019—just 1 year after the full implementation of our tax reform—we had the best economy of my lifetime. There was an end to corporate inversions. There was an economic boom. We had a record low unemployment rate—alltime record low unemployment for African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, women. Workforce participation rate was at multidecade highs. Wages were growing, and wages were growing fastest for the lowest income workers. Under our regulatory and tax reforms, we were narrowing the income gap and allowing Americans to create wealth and prosperity and achieve a higher standard of living.

I ask my colleagues: What was so bad about that? What is really so bad about the best economy of my lifetime—rising wages, a better standard of living, and a narrowing of the income gap? What was so bad about that that you want to throw it out the door, out the window? I don't get that. I don't get that at all.

It is not too late. Maybe we will be fortunate enough to be able to dodge this. But if we don't, a lot of families, workers, Americans of all walks of life will have a lower standard of living as a result of this very ill-conceived tax policy in the Biden administration.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Wisconsin.

(The remarks of Ms. BALDWIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 3022 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EDUCATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about America's education system.

As a result of the pandemic, parents have had a front-row seat to their kids' education. Parents are now engaged with their kids' schools much more than ever before. Many parents have had to make tough decisions about a number of things during the pandemic, but especially about their children's education.

Yet parental involvement, I believe, is a good thing for kids in our schools. The more parental involvement, the better. Parents deserve a say in what their kids learn and how best to learn it.

But all across America, school boards and teachers unions and city councils have been outraged to see parents involved as they have been.

Many parents are furious right now. In many cases, they have found out their kids were spending more time on liberal ideology than they were on science or on math.

Earlier this year, the State of California proposed teaching math—hard to believe, but this is what they said—from a social justice perspective—math from a social justice perspective.

Parents, appropriately, were furious, and the proposal was not rejected completely, but just postponed until next year.

Oregon now allows students to graduate—graduate—without proving they are proficient in reading, in writing, or in math.

San Francisco schools spent the entire last year closed, yet the San Francisco school board had spare time to propose changing the name of Abraham Lincoln High School. Kids are not in school, but the school board had plenty of time to consider and propose changing the name of Abraham Lincoln High School.

Well, parents, again, were enraged and this proposal was dropped.

It is very obvious why so many parents all across the country are so angry right now. They work hard. They pay their taxes. And what they see day in and day out are Democratic politicians hurting their kids' future, getting in the way of the education that parents believe their children need.

Last week, we saw even more proof. The Department of Education published the National Assessment of Educational Progress. It comes out every 5 years. It was time. It is the Nation's report card. This year's report card shows test scores in math and in reading have plummeted. This was the first time these scores have dropped in 50 years.

The lesson is obvious: We are spending too much time away from the things that students ought to be spending their time on. We need to spend less time on ideology, more time on education of the basics—real knowledge, real skills.

Many school boards across the country refuse to listen. In fact, the National School Boards Association complained to the Biden administration about angry parents. Now the Attorney General is treating angry parents like criminals. The Attorney General of the United States is deciding that angry parents are to be treated like criminals. Attorney General Garland has ordered Federal prosecutors to work with local police to form “strategies for addressing threats against school administrators, board members, teachers, and staff.”

The Department of Justice says it will form a task force on these alleged threats against school boards. The task force is going to include representatives from the Department’s Criminal Division, from the National Security Division, the Civil Rights Division, and Federal prosecutors, as well as the FBI.

Joe Biden is sending in the cavalry to school board meetings to focus on parents rather than focusing on the education the children need and deserve. He is sending the National Security Division after moms and dads because they are concerned about their children’s education.

After the Attorney General’s order, I joined with 10 of my Republican colleagues and demanded a legal justification from Attorney General Garland. I still haven’t received a response.

We have also found out that Attorney General Garland has a family member who helps schools develop left-wing curriculum. The Attorney General’s family member is helping schools developing leftwing curriculum. The Attorney General’s son-in-law owns a company with millions and millions of dollars in government contracts—contracts by the Attorney General’s son-in-law—contracts with schools all across America.

Well, maybe it is a coincidence, and maybe it is not. Attorney General Garland needs to tell the American people whether this played a role in his decision to treat parents like criminals.

Yet the problem is much bigger than the Attorney General of the United States. The problem is how Democrats treat and think about parents and working families.

The former Governor of the State of Virginia said recently:

I don’t think parents should be telling schools what they can teach.

This is the former Governor of Virginia:

I don’t think parents should be telling schools what they can teach.

Last month, Senator MIKE BRAUN asked the Secretary of Education about the role of parents in education. He asked if parents were “the primary stakeholder” in their kids’ education.

Secretary Cardona said this: “They’re an important stakeholder.”

In other words, they are not the primary stakeholders. Parents are not the primary stakeholders.

Is it any surprise so many parents are deciding to educate their children at home?

So who does the Secretary of Education think is the primary educator of our children? The union bosses? Are they the primary educators of our children?

Democrats act like kids are the property of the schools. And schools, of course, are the property—in the minds of the Democrats—of the teachers unions. Parents have every right to be upset with what is happening in the public schools all across this Nation. Parents have every right to demand real improvements.

It is time for the Democrats to stop taking orders from the teachers unions and start listening to parents and to the students.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, over the last couple of years, our Democratic colleagues have suggested a range of unrealistic and downright harmful policies in our shared goal—and I emphasize the words “shared goal”—to reduce carbon emissions. But it is not just a question of what you are doing; it is a question of how you are going about doing it. The way they are going about doing it is going to raise the prices of electricity, gasoline, and all forms of energy on people on fixed incomes, people who are seniors living on Social Security, and others. They have proposed everything from the socialist agenda that is the Green New Deal to more targeted, but no more realistic, zero net emission mandates.

Now, we all know that energy transition occurs at all times. I have traveled to India—perhaps the Presiding Officer has—and to other countries where people literally cook their food using cow manure patties, dried cow manure. I remember Prime Minister Modi coming to Houston, TX, during an event that we called “Howdy, Modi!” when he heralded the use of increased access to cooking gas so that his constituents, Indians, wouldn’t have to use dried cow dung to cook their food—that represents progress—or wouldn’t have to use wood chips anymore.

Then the transition was to coal, then to natural gas, nuclear, and other forms of energy. So energy transition occurs at all times. The only question is how it comes about, whether it is as a result of higher taxes and forced government mandates or whether it is which form of energy competes favorably for consumers because of its cost and availability.

Well, of all of the dangerous policy proposals, I think the reckless tax-and-spending-spree bill takes the cake. This is the so-called reconciliation bill that is now pending over in the House, or is being negotiated. Nobody has actually seen it yet, but we keep hearing what is in it, and we keep hearing that the left is negotiating with the far left. This is what happens when our Democratic colleagues don’t include people in the opposing political party to try

to build consensus. It is pretty hard, particularly when you only have 50 votes.

This isn’t like FDR’s New Deal after the Great Depression, wherein he had huge majorities. I think what our Democratic colleagues are finding out is that, when they try to go it alone, passing these radical policies is really, really hard to do because you have no room for error.

This reminds me of the yellow jackets protests in France, starting back in 2018, as to what is happening now with some of these mandates and these higher taxes. This was, as you may recall, a social movement of French working-class families who felt disenfranchised from the urban elite, who “can focus on the end of the world,” they said, “while we’re worrying about the end of the month.” I think it is pretty apt to where we are today. This reckless tax-and-spending spree not only compiles the most irresponsible policies into one massive bill, as I said, but our Democratic colleagues, along with the White House, are trying to pass it in a 50-50 Senate, on a party-line vote.

Well, talk about bad timing. This comes at a time when Texans and other Americans are already being pummeled by rising costs, especially at the gas pump. Inflation is rearing its ugly head everywhere in terms of energy costs, groceries, commodities, and with things like a washing machine or a new refrigerator. Try buying a new house, and you will see the cost has just jumped dramatically.

It is a demonstrable fact that, in the last year, gasoline costs have gone up 55 percent. The average price today is about \$3.33 a gallon. A year ago, it was \$2.16 a gallon. For somebody who drives a pickup truck—and we have a lot of pickup trucks in Texas—it would have cost \$56 for a tank of gas a year ago, but, today, it is \$87—a \$31 increase.

Unfortunately, sky-high gasoline prices aren’t the only growing drain on family budgets. As I mentioned, electricity, groceries, clothing, eating out occasionally at a restaurant, and countless other expenses are on the rise. Prices are so high that inflation is outpacing wage growth, essentially giving workers a pay cut. Let me say that again. If you are earning, let’s say, \$10,000 a year—just to pick a number—and inflation rises like it does with gasoline costs, you are effectively getting a pay cut because of the rising costs of goods and services.

But that doesn’t seem to deter our Democratic colleagues from moving full steam ahead on legislation that would drive these costs even higher. After spending nearly \$2 billion earlier this year on a party-line vote, our colleagues are back for round 2, and this time they are prepared to take a wrecking ball to one of our crown jewels in this country, which is our energy sector. By drowning the energy sector in tax hikes or in increased regulations and costs, our Democratic colleagues think that they can achieve their green